Customer No. 24498
Internal Docket No. PF040026
Date of Office Action: 06/26/2008

Remarks / Discussion of Issues

Claims 1-10 are pending, and claims 1-10 stand rejected.

Claims 1-10 have been amended to address informality objections. Applicants submit that the objections to claims 1-10 have been overcome and respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection to claims 1-10.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Nyman et al. (US Patent Number 7,089,298), hereinafter referred to as Nyman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, reference must teach every element of the claim. It is respectfully submitted that the Office action failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation.

Applicants' claim 1 recites,

> A method for inserting a new device in a community of devices wherein each device of the community is able to store insertion requests received from at least one new device and to forward these insertion requests to <u>a device, chosen by a user of the community</u> for performing at least one user action for authorizing the insertion of the new device in the community. (Emphasis added.)

The Office action alleges that Nyman at item 260, Fig. 3 and at column 16, lines 49-64 discloses the feature of "a device, chosen by a user of the community." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Nyman appears to be directed towards the resolution of device name conflicts when adding devices to existing ad hoc short-range wireless network systems. (Abstract). Nyman at Fig. 1A apparently discloses the addition of a hypothetical user's wireless device (i.e. Mark's device) to an ad hoc network community. Nyman seems to illustrate a hypothetical network community which consists of devices associated with Paul, Ian, Dan Jones, Eve, Dan Smith, and Alice, respectively. Nyman at Fig. 3, item 260, appears

Customer No. 24498
Internal Docket No. PF040026
Date of Office Action: 06/26/2008

to discloses a step wherein if the new device (i.e. Mark's device) is
authorized, then Paul's device sends an updated name table to Mark's
device. In other words, as explained in column 16, lines 49-64 of Nyman, it
is determined in Paul's device whether Mark's device is authorized to join the
ad hoc network. If Mark's device is authorized to join the network, then
Paul's device appears to suggest forwarding an updated name manager table
to Mark's device.

   Although Paul's device may determine whether Mark's device is
authorized to join the community of devices, Paul's device is not "a device,
chosen by a user of the community," as recited in Applicants' claim 1.
Nyman at column 13, lines 50-54 and at item 252 of Fig. 3, in the "Process
to Add New Device," suggests that the process for Mark's device to join the
community begins when Mark's device forms a new wireless communication
link with Paul's device. Mark's device then apparently forwards an "Add
Device" message to Paul's device, which in turn forwards the message to
Ian's device, which forwards the message to Dan Jones' device, etc. At Fig.
3, item 260, Paul's device apparently determines whether Mark's device is
authorized to join the community. However, in contrast to Applicants' claim
1, Paul's device was not chosen by a user of the community.

   It appears that Paul's device determines whether Mark's device is
authorized to join the community because Mark's device had already
established a communication link with Paul's device. Thus, Paul's device was
not <u>chosen</u> by a user among Nyman's hypothetical network community (i.e.
Ian, Dan Jones, Eve, Dan Smith, or Alice) to authorize the insertion of Mark's
device into the community. Nowhere does Nyman disclose, teach or even
suggest "<u>a device, chosen by a user of the community</u> for performing at
least one user action for authorizing the insertion of the new device in the
community," as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not

Customer No. 24498
Internal Docket No. PF040026
Date of Office Action: 06/26/2008

anticipated by Nyman. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Independent claims 5 and 9, include several similar distinguishing features as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

For example, claim 5 includes the features of: forwarding, by each device of the community which receives a request from a device chosen by a user of the community, the at least one stored insertion request to said user chosen device; wherein said user chosen device is chosen by the user for performing at least one user action for authorizing the insertion of the new device in the community.

Claim 9 includes the features of: a network interface for sending the at least one insertion request stored in said first memory upon request from a device chosen by a user of the community for performing at least one user action for authorizing the insertion of the new device in the community.

The Office action uses substantially the same arguments as set forth with regard to claim 1, alleging that independent claims 5 and 9 are anticipated by Nyman. Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments for claim 1 and apply them to independent claims 5 and 9. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 9 are not anticipated by Nyman and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Dependent claims 2-4 depend from independent claim 1, dependent claims 6-8 depend from independent claim 5, and dependent claim 10 depends from independent claim 9. Each dependent claim incorporates by reference all of the features of the allowable parent claim. Furthermore, each dependent claim includes additional distinguishing features. For each dependent claim, Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments from claim 1 and applies them to the respective dependent claim. As such,

Customer No. 24498
Internal Docket No. PF040026
Date of Office Action: 06/26/2008

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable base claim.

Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been traversed and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection to these claims.

Customer No. 24498
Internal Docket No. PF040026
Date of Office Action: 06/26/2008

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Please charge any required additional fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Olivier Heen, et al.

By: Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing LLC
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 7/27/09

9